

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/037,423	10/24/2001	Richard B. Ertel	907B.0003.U1(US)	907B.0003.U1(US) 7192	
29683	7590 09/06/2005		EXAMINER		
HARRINGTON & SMITH, LLP 4 RESEARCH DRIVE			PHU, PHUONG M		
	CT 06484-6212		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
•			2631		

DATE MAILED: 09/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/037,423	ERTEL ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Phuong Phu	2631				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 O	ctober 2001					
· · · · <u></u>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is						
• •	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
· <u> </u>						
	Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) 19 is/are allowed.	wit from consideration.					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<u> </u>					
Application Papers						
·· _	_	•				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
	ammer. Note the attached Office	Action of form P10-132.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau 	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
•						
Attachment(s)	_					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date Paper No(s)/Mail Date Paper No(s)/Mail Date Other:						

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1, 4, 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yun et al (5,886,988).
 - -Regarding to claim 1, see figure, Yun et al discloses a method comprising:

step (100) (see figure 1), within a coverage area of a base station (BS), of having a multielement antenna array (18, 19), estimating a spatial signature vector (SSV) for individual ones of a plurality of active subscriber stations (SSs) (see A_k of Eq. 3, col. 10, lines 38-53); and

step (100) of assigning a system resource (channel assignment) to a subscriber station (SS) that minimizes the similarity of the determined SSVs of the SSs sharing the system resource (see col. 9, lines 23-44, col. 12, lines 31-43).

-Regarding to claim 4, Yun et al discloses step (100) of beamforming using the multi-element antenna array so as to maximize the signal to interference plus noise ratio (SNR) for a signal transmitted from a first SS by steering a null towards a second potentially interfering SS to minimize interference from the second SS (see figure 2, col. 2, lines 48-63).

-Regarding to claim 5, Yun et al discloses step (100) of receiving the signal received from the desired SS, followed by a step of spatial filtering (46) (see figure 1).

Application/Control Number: 10/037,423 Page 3

Art Unit: 2631

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 7, 10, 11, 13, 16, 17are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yun et al.
- -Regarding to claims 7, 13, similarly as applied to claim 1, Yun et al discloses a system comprises:

step/means (100) (see figure 1), within a coverage area of a base station (BS), of having a multi-element antenna array (18, 19), estimating a spatial signature vector (SSV) for individual ones of a plurality of active subscriber stations (SSs) (see Ak of Eq. 3, col. 10, lines 38-53); and

step/means (100) of assigning a system resource (channel assignment) to a subscriber station (SS) that minimizes the similarity of the determined SSVs of the SSs sharing the system resource (see col. 9, lines 23-44, col. 12, lines 31-43).

Yun et al does not disclose whether the channel assignment is assigning a spreading code to the subscriber station (SS).

However, Yun et al discloses that his system can be applied for CDMA systems (see col. 1, lines 16-30).

On the other hand, assigning channel to a station by assigning a unique spreading code to that station in a CDMA system is well-known in the art, and the examiner takes Official Notice. Art Unit: 2631

Therefore, for an application, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to implement Yun et al in such a way that means (100) would assign a system resource (by assigning a spreading code) to a subscriber station (SS) that minimizes the similarity of the determined SSVs of the SSs sharing the system resource, as being required.

-Regarding to claims 10, 16, Yun et al discloses that means (100) processor further operates beamforming circuitry with said multi-element antenna array so as to maximize the signal to interference plus noise ratio (SINR) for a signal transmitted from a first SS by steering a null towards a second same-code SS to minimize interference from the second same-code SS (see figure 2).

-Regarding to claims 11, 17, as applied to claim 7, in Yun et al in view of Barratt et al, a despreader is inherently included for despreading a signal received from SSs in order to decode the received signal from a respectively assigned spreading code. Yun et al further teaches as a spatial filter (46) for processing the received signal (see figure 1); therefore, in Yun et al in view of Barratt et al, the spatial filter is inherently coupled to said despreader.

- 5. Claims 6 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yun et al, in view of Barratt et al (5,592,490).
- -Regarding to claim 6, Yun et al discloses step (100) of, from the spatial signature vectors $(A_{k,j})$ received from a plurality of same-code subscriber stations, computing antenna element weight vectors $(W_{k,j}^D)$ (see col. 15, lines 25-45).

Yun et al does not disclose in detail how the spatial signature vectors are obtained, as claimed.

However, Yun et al teaches that the spatial signature vectors can be obtained with a method taught by Barratt et al (see col. 8, line 64 to col. 9, line 17, col. 15, lines 47).

Barratt et al teaches obtaining spatial signature vectors by operating the SSs to obtain channel estimates (a_{br}) comprised of the path amplitude and phase from each of m antenna elements and to use the m channel estimates as spatial signature vectors (see col. 3, lines 26-59).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to implement Yun et al in such a way that each of spatial signature vectors are respectively obtained by operating the SSs to obtain channel estimates comprised of the path amplitude and phase from each of m antenna elements and to use the m channel estimates as the spatial signature vectors, as taught by Barratt et al, in order to obtain the spatial signature vector as being required for computing antenna element weight vectors.

-Claim 18 is rejected with similar reasons set forth for claim 6.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 6. Claim 19 is allowed.
- 7. Claims 2, 3, 8, 9, 12, 14 and 15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuong Phu whose telephone number is 571-272-3009. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (6:30-2:30).

Art Unit: 2631

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mohammad Ghayour can be reached on 571-272-3021. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Phuong Phu Primary Examiner Art Unit 2631

Phung Phu

Phuong Phu 08/29/2005